



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PENNSYLVANIA AND VIRGINIA
BOUNDARY CONTROVERSY.

A paper read before the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania.

By JOHN E. POTTER, Pittsburgh, Pa.

While all are familiar with the old nursery rhyme

"In the good old Colony times,
When we lived under the King,"

yet few Pittsburghers stop to consider that, during a portion of the good old Colony times, they were not good, loyal Pennsylvanians, but for a time were residents of at first, Augusta district, and later, Yohogania County, Virginia, and were, therefore, citizens of that Commonwealth and subject to its jurisdiction.

This fact was due more to physical and geographic reasons than political. For many years, the mountain ranges of Central Pennsylvania created a formidable barrier between the eastern and western portions of our State. The topography of Southwestern Pennsylvania seemed to naturally connect it with Maryland and Virginia.

The early opening of the Ohio Company's Path, which afterwards became Braddock's Road, gave an easy access to Southwestern Pennsylvania from the region lying southeast of it, while the wilderness separating from the settled portion of the State remained as impenetrable as ever. For this reason, the majority of the very early settlers of Southwest Pennsylvania came from Virginia and Maryland.

The principle of title by conquest and settlement, with utter disregard of all other considerations and rights, was very deeply ingrained into the people of that period. It is, therefore, not at all strange that

Virginia soon laid claim to a region which, to anyone possessing any ordinary gift of foresight, seemed destined to occupy an important and strategic position in the history of the nation. In doing this, however, Virginia wilfully ignored the prior title of the Penns.

The history of the boundary dispute between Pennsylvania and Virginia is a long drawn out story. It is a fruitful subject suggesting many topics for study and investigation. It brings in the original grants from the Crown, not only to Pennsylvania and Virginia, but also to Maryland, and the relative standing of each.

Lord Dunmore's War is closely connected with this attempt of Virginia to extend her borders. The temporary change of the name of Fort Pitt to Fort Dunmore, which became the headquarters of the local Virginia authority, while the Penns maintained a rival seat of government at Hannastown, marks the climax of the struggle.

Mason and Dixon's line will necessarily be referred to in this narrative, for while it is the line between Maryland and Pennsylvania, yet the line between Pennsylvania and Virginia, as finally agreed upon and located, is merely a prolongation of Mason and Dixon's line.

We are also reminded of how near Pittsburgh came to being located in a slave State, if it had remained in Virginia. Pennsylvania passed an Act for the gradual abolition of slavery in 1780, while slavery continued in Virginia for eighty-five years longer.

The leading character in this story of Virginia's connection with history of Southwestern Pennsylvania was the immortal Washington, who, when a twenty-two year-old youth, passed through Pittsburgh in 1753 as a special envoy, commissioned by Gov. Dinwiddie of Virginia to investigate the French forces and designs, and to warn the French to vacate this section.

Washington met here several parties who had come out under the Ohio Company, an Association formed in 1748 in Virginia under a royal grant. The primary object of the formation of the Ohio Company was to direct the trade from this region to the Potomac Route and to people this section with Virginians. This Company was granted 500,000 acres west of the mountains, to be chiefly on the south side of the Ohio River, between the Monongahela and the Kanawha, but with the privilege to take part of the quantity north of the Ohio. General Washington's brothers, Lawrence and John Augustine, were largely interested in the Ohio Company. Christopher Gist was its Agent to select the lands and to conciliate the Indians.

It was this Ohio Company which originally built the fort at the Forks of the Ohio, soon captured by the French and christened Fort Duquesne, but later recaptured by the British and rebuilt as Fort Pitt.

The stirring events of Great Meadows and Fort Necessity, which are among the most important in the history of our Country, were participated in almost exclusively by Virginians, as far as the English were concerned. The Pennsylvania Assembly at this time refused to give any aid to this portion of its own State.

But the event with which the people of Pittsburgh are perhaps the most familiar, is Braddock's defeat. While Braddock's Army included a regiment of regular British soldiers, yet the majority of his Provincial troops were from Virginia. Braddock's defeat in its effect had something in common with Bull Run. The fear caused by this disaster was so universal and widespread that Cumberland County, which, in 1756 included nearly all of Pennsylvania west of the Susquehanna, was practically depopulated of English settlers. This fact aroused the British Government to the importance of the crisis, and in 1758 General Forbes' Army of 7000 were sent out and the French supremacy over the upper Ohio was forever terminated.

As a legal proposition, the claim of Virginia to Southwestern Pennsylvania had very little standing. The original grant to the Southern Company never went above forty degrees north latitude, and this charter was revoked in 1624. This means that Virginia simply had left whatever was not subsequently granted to some other colony.

Between the Penns and Lord Baltimore, there is great room for question as to whether or not, as an abstract proposition, Lord Baltimore was not the nearest right in his contention. The boundary controversy between Pennsylvania and Maryland was merely a case of pertinacity *versus* pugnacity, and as usual pertinacity won out. A Maryland writer says, "If, however, there was anything that could equal the facilities of the Marylanders in making trouble, it was the untiring perseverance with which the Penns devoted themselves to the contest and followed their opponents in all their doublings and they had their reward."

There is, however, absolutely no justification, as far as the records are concerned, for the claim of Virginia to any portion of the land which lies within the present limits of Pennsylvania.

On the other hand, we should take into account the people which Virginia had been sending into this section, the money spent by her citizens in developing it, and the military forces furnished by Virginia to drive out the French and subdue the Indians. The cowardly, niggardly and parsimonious policy of the Pennsylvania provincial government in refusing to do anything or spend anything for the relief, benefit or development of this portion of the State stands out in very strong contrast from this standpoint. Is there, then, any wonder that the Virginians easily persuaded themselves to believe that they were honestly and justly entitled to Southwestern Pennsylvania?

The Pennsylvania and Virginia boundary dispute

may be said to have begun with the founding of the Ohio Company in 1748. The issue was kept alive for thirty-two years or until Virginia reluctantly ratified the agreement of the Boundary Commissioners in 1780.

The situation did not become acute until the Penns, after the Treaty of Fort Stanwix in 1768 and the purchase by them at that time from the Indians of the lands west of the Susquehanna, offered these lands for sale in 1769 at five pounds per hundred acres. In 1771, Bedford County was erected which extended over this section, the government of the Penns.

John Murray, Earl of Dunmore, was appointed Governor of Virginia in 1772. Lord Dunmore was unscrupulous, arbitrary and cruel. One of his first acts as governor, was to press the claims of Virginia to Southwestern Pennsylvania. He found a willing tool and a man to his liking in one Dr. John Connolly, who, strange to say, was a Pennsylvanian, being a native of Lancaster County.

George Washington, speaking in his Journal of his visit to Fort Pitt in 1770, tells of meeting at Semple's Tavern, Dr. John Connolly, "Nephew to Col. Croghan, a very sensible and intelligent man, who had travelled over a good part of this Western Country, both by land and water."

Dr. Connolly came to Pittsburgh as the representative of Lord Dunmore in 1773, and erected a small stockade in the ruins of Fort Pitt, calling it Fort Dunmore, and issued a formal proclamation in the name of the Governor of Virginia. Arthur St. Clair, representing the Penns, had Connolly arrested and thrown into jail at Hannastown, but he was released on bail. At the next session of Court at Hannastown, Connolly reported with one hundred and fifty armed men and arrested the three Justices, sending them under guard to Staunton, Virginia. In a letter from Governor Penn

to Lord Dunmore, protesting against Connolly's actions, Penn states that Pittsburgh is six miles eastward of the western extent of his Province.

Virginia apparently claimed everything west of Laurel Ridge, the present boundary line between Somerset and Westmoreland Counties, but her claims do not appear to have been extended north of the Kiskiminitas, the Allegheny and the Ohio.

John Penn, as against the pretensions of Virginia, maintained that the southerly boundary line of Pennsylvania was the southerly line of the fortieth degree of north latitude. He, however, conceded that the westerly line of Pennsylvania must be parallel with the line of the Delaware River at a distance of five degrees of longitude westerly therefrom. The Penns in 1774 offered to compromise with Virginia by extending Mason and Dixon's line to the Monongahela River, and then following that river to the Ohio. Virginia rejected this offer as it gave Pittsburgh to Pennsylvania.

If Virginia had accepted this proposition, Pennsylvania would have lost the whole of Beaver, Lawrence and Mercer Counties, nearly all of Washington, two-fifths of Allegheny, and portions of Greene, Fayette, Butler, Venango, Crawford and Erie Counties.

The portions lost to this State north of the Ohio, would not have gone to Virginia, but would have passed to the Federal Government and, in all probability, have later become a part of Ohio.

On the other hand, the Virginia Legislature in 1776 passed a Resolution providing that the boundary line between Pennsylvania and Virginia should be the westerly line of Maryland extended north until it intersected the latitude of forty degrees, and thence westerly along said latitude until the distance of five degrees of longitude from the Delaware was reached, and thence from said point five degrees from the meanderings of the Delaware.

Thus it will be seen that both Governor Penn and Lord Dunmore at times offered the other more than the other claimed, so little did either know as to the correct location of their boundary lines.

The Virginia Courts for the district of West Augusta were held in Pittsburgh, then called Fort Dunmore, during 1775 and 1776. The district was divided into three counties called Ohio, Yohogania and Monongalia. Pittsburgh was in Yohogania County, which included the greater part of the present Allegheny and Washington Counties.

In these days, when women's rights are kept so prominently in the foreground, it is somewhat startling to read in the old Court Records of the district of West Augusta the following court order made on February 22, 1775:

“Ordered that the Sheriff employ a workman to build a ducking stool at the confluence of the Ohio with the Monongahela.”

What would the poor, oppressed, down-trodden women of one hundred and thirty-eight years ago, who were threatened with the Ducking Stool for merely exercising their right of free speech, have thought of their window-smashing sisters of the present day?

The Courts of Yohogania County were held at the farm of Andrew Heath, a mile or so above West Elizabeth, but within the present lines of Allegheny County, until August 28, 1780, when the boundary agreement between Pennsylvania and Virginia went into effect. Washington County was erected on March 21, 1781, and the records of Yohogania County, Virginia, became part of the records of Washington County, Pennsylvania.

Lord Dunmore and Dr. Connolly not only stirred up the struggle between Pennsylvania and Virginia, but also, by their continued cruelty and treachery in their

dealings with the Indians, brought on the noted Dunmore's War. The history of this War contains some of the blackest and most shameful incidents in the history of our Nation. During this struggle, the celebrated speech of Logan is supposed to have been delivered. I am aware that the iconoclast denies that Logan was the author of this speech, claiming that it was written by Thomas Jefferson. Some descendant of this iconoclast will no doubt in time endeavor to prove that Logan never existed and that Dunmore's War was a creation of the disordered imagination of the early historians of our Country.

The War of the Revolution, however, was close at hand, Lord Dunmore had to flee and Dr. Connolly, being a notorious Tory, was arrested for treason but soon released. He reported to General Gage at Boston, received a Commission as Lieutenant Colonel to raise a regiment among the Indians. He was captured at Hagerstown, Maryland, on his way West and was held prisoner until exchanged in 1781. Virginia continued, however, to maintain her claims for several years after Lord Dunmore and Dr. Connolly had disappeared as actors in this play.

Capt. John Neville arrived in Pittsburgh in August 1775, with a company of one hundred men and took possession of Fort Pitt. Captain, afterwards General, Neville, was a true patriot and thoroughly loyal to the Colonies. The boundary dispute was dropped temporarily during the struggle with the mother Country, and in 1779 both Pennsylvania and Virginia agreed to a joint commission to settle the matter.

The line finally agreed upon was an extension of Mason and Dixon's Line, and a brief reference to that division line between Pennsylvania and Maryland is, therefore, necessary.

The Charter to Lord Baltimore (Cecilius Calvert), was granted in June, 1632, and called for the fortieth

degree north latitude and the first fountain of the Potomac as the northern boundary.

The Charter to William Penn, dated March 4, 1681, called for a boundary on the south by a circle drawn at twelve miles distant from New Castle northward, and westward into the beginning of the fortieth degree of north latitude and thence by a straight line westward five degrees in longitude. The beginning of the fortieth degree of north latitude, however, was fifty miles south of New Castle, instead of twelve miles north. The matter was further complicated by the question as to which point in New Castle was to be the centre of the circle with a twelve-mile radius; was it at the centre or on the edge of the town?

The important question, however, was whether the dividing line between Maryland and Virginia was the northern or the southern line of the fortieth degree of north latitude. If not either—where? Is it any wonder that this dispute waxed warm and bitter for eighty-two years?

Among the compliments and endearing epithets interchanged between the belligerent Pennsylvanians and Marylanders were the terms “Quaking Cowards” applied to the Pennites, who retaliated by styling their opponents “Hominy Gentry.”

Commissioners were appointed by both sides in 1750 who made such slow progress that in August, 1763, the Penns and Lord Baltimore employed Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, two astronomers in London, to complete the work.

The boundary line located by these men was $39^{\circ} 43' 32''$ or about nineteen miles south of the northerly line of the fortieth degree of north latitude. This line was run west about one hundred and sixty miles out in the Allegheny mountains by June, 1766, when the Indians forbade the Surveyors going any farther.

Permission was then secured by the Governors of

Maryland and Pennsylvania from the Six Nations, and in the Summer of 1767 the line was run to the western limit of Maryland, being the meridian of the first fountain of the Potomac.

The Surveyors, however, did not stop there, they having determined, if possible, to reach the end of the five degrees of longitude, the extent of the Penn grant West. However, when they arrived at the Warrior branch of the old Catawba Path, at the second crossing of Dunkard Creek, a little west of Mt. Morris in Greene County, the Indian escort notified them that they had been instructed by their Chiefs in Council not to let the line be run westward of that Path.

Messrs. Mason and Dixon reported to the Commissioners on December 27, 1767, and then prepared the map of their work. On November 9, 1768, they made their final report to the Proprietaries.

In 1779, the Commissioners appointed to settle the boundary dispute between Pennsylvania and Maryland, being George Bryan, John Ewing and David Rittenhouse, representing Pennsylvania, and Right Rev. James Madison, Rev. Robert Andrews and Thomas Lewis on the part of Virginia, met at Baltimore. The final agreement was signed on August 31, 1779. Its terms were extremely simple, considering the many years that the controversy had lasted; it was as follows:

“To extend Mason and Dixon’s line due West five degrees of longitude, to be computed from the River Delaware, for the southern boundary of Pennsylvania; and that a meridian drawn from the western extremity thereof to the northern line of said State be the western line of said State forever.”

The Pennsylvania Legislature confirmed this Agreement on November 19, 1779.

Virginia delayed action, and in the meantime appointed representatives who met at Redstone Old Fort

and also at Coxe's Fort, in Washington County, near the Monongahela River, above Elizabeth, and at other points, and granted hundreds of Certificates to claimants under Virginia Settlement Rights. These Certificates have always been known as Virginia Certificates. The title to General Washington's lands in Mt. Pleasant Township, Washington County, is based on Virginia Certificates.

It is easy to imagine what readily would and what really did follow, viz, that a storm of indignation was raised which all but wrecked the compromise agreement and again brought Pennsylvania and Virginia to the verge of war.

However, in July, 1780, the Legislature of Virginia passed an Act confirming the Baltimore agreement, but with the proviso, viz: "On condition that the private property and rights of all persons acquired under, founded on, or recognized by the laws of either country previous to the date hereof, be saved and confirmed to them." Pennsylvania, although greatly protesting, on September 23, 1780, through her Legislature, accepted the condition and the long drawn-out dispute was finally at an end.

Boyd Crumrine, Esq., of Washington, Pa., the best living authority on the Pennsylvania-Virginia boundary controversy, to whom credit is due for a large part of the facts and information given in this paper, has in his possession an original document giving the names of six hundred and fifty-nine settlers who, between November 17, 1779, and June 25, 1780, proved their titles under Virginia entries before the Commissioners from Virginia.

The Returns of Survey, in the office of the Secretary of Internal Affairs at Harrisburg, show that ninety-six Returns of Survey under Virginia entries were made to lands now located within the lines of Allegheny County.

All that was then left to be done was the running of the permanent boundary line on the ground.

The Commission appointed for this purpose in 1783 consisted, on the part of Virginia, of the Right Rev. James Madison, Bishop of Virginia; Rev. Robert Andrews, John Page and Thomas Lewis. The Pennsylvania Commissioners were John Lukens, Surveyor General; Rev. John Ewing, D.D., David Rittenhouse and Thomas Hutchins. The corner was located by astronomical observations. An observatory was erected at Wilmington, Delaware, near the eastern end of the line, and a similar one near the supposed location of the western end. During six weeks preceding the Autumnal equinox of 1784, continued observations were made to determine the respective meridians and latitude. A representative of each party meeting, they found a difference of twenty minutes, one and one-eighth seconds. The original grant of the Penns called for five degrees of longitude. They then calculated that twenty minutes of time were equal to five degrees of longitude and made allowance for the one and one-eighth seconds and shortened the line to twenty minutes from the Delaware and thus permanently located the southwest corner of Pennsylvania.

It is very interesting and instructive at this stage of the world's history and progress, especially when at times one hears some pessimist groaning over the degeneracy of the times, to read, that notwithstanding the fact that there were two clergymen among the representatives from Virginia, and one from Pennsylvania on the boundary commission, during the six weeks' service of these estimable gentlemen there was consumed, or at least was furnished, sixty gallons of spirits, twenty gallons brandy, forty gallons Madeira wine, two hundred pounds loaf sugar and a keg of lime juice.

This incident reminds one of the story about good

old Dr. Charles Beatty, the first Presbyterian Clergymen west of the Alleghenies. Dr. Beatty was at one time Chaplain of a company of soldiers commanded by Dr. Franklin. We quote Franklin's own words as given in Day's Historical Collections.

"We had for our Chaplain a zealous Presbyterian Minister, Mr. Beatty, who complained to me that the men did not generally attend his prayers and exhortations. When they enlisted they were promised, besides pay and provisions, a gill of rum a day, which was punctually served out to them, half in the morning and half in the evening; and I observed they were punctual in attending to receive it, upon which I said to Mr. Beatty, 'It is, perhaps, below the dignity of your profession to act as steward of the rum; but if you were to distribute it out, only just after prayers, you would have them all about you.' He liked the thought, undertook the task, and, with the help of a few hands to measure out the liquor, executed it to satisfaction; and never were prayers more generally and punctually attended. So that I think this method preferable to the punishment inflicted by some military laws, for non-attendance on divine service."

The year following, 1785, the westerly line of Pennsylvania was run from the corner so established to the Ohio River, by Col. Andrew Porter and David Rittenhouse for Pennsylvania, and Joseph Neville and Andrew Ellicott for Virginia. The westerly line was completed to Lake Erie in 1786 by Colonel Porter, and Col. Alex. McClain.

The Erie Triangle belonged to New York and Massachusetts and was ceded by them to the Federal Government and then purchased by Pennsylvania in 1792, for \$151,640.

The most remarkable feature, however, connected with the history of this long, drawn-out controversy, is the fact that the Dove of Peace apparently spread her

wings over this so long disturbed region as soon as the settlement was formally agreed upon.

The records of the Courts of Washington, Allegheny and Fayette Counties show so comparatively few lawsuits and contests that the query at once arises as to why this is the case, especially in a section settled with a class of people with so supposedly belligerent proclivities as the Scotch-Irish.

This point cannot be better illustrated than by a reference to the leading case of litigation caused by the boundary question. This contest came very close to Pittsburgh as the question involved was the ownership of Neville Island, formerly known as Montours Island, in the Ohio River. The case being *Simms vs. Irvine*, decided May 28, 1799, in the Supreme Court of the United States on appeal from the Circuit Court of Pennsylvania.

The King of Great Britain, at the close of the War with France in 1763, empowered and commanded the Governors of the Colonies to reward the officers and soldiers who had served in North America to the end of the War, with gifts of unappropriated lands. Under the proclamation, one Maj. William Douglass received a right for five thousand acres which he assigned to Charles Simms, a citizen of Virginia. In May, 1780, Simms, as Assignee, received from the Register of the Virginia Land Office, a Military Warrant for five thousand acres which he claimed he delivered to the Surveyor of Yohogania County, with directions to locate it in several parcels, one of which was to be Montours Island.

General William Irvine, a distinguished soldier of the Revolution, then commanding officer at Pittsburgh, received by Act of the Legislature passed September 24, 1783, a Pre-emption right. The Act is entitled "An Act to grant the right of pre-emption to an island, known by the name of Montours Island, in the Ohio

River, to Brigadier General William Irvine. The Surveyor General was directed to cause a survey of the Island to be made and have the same returned into the Land Office for confirmation by Patent. This was done, and on December 18, 1787, General Irvine paid into the Reciever-General's Office £283, 13s. 6d., the cost of the Island at £30 per hundred acres (or eighty cents per acre), and received his Patent.

An ejectment suit was then brought against Gen. Irvine by Simms in the Circuit Court of Pennsylvania to recover the Island under his military grant. The jury found that the Deputy Surveyors for Washington County had received from the Surveyor General the list of entries which contained an entry for the land claimed by Simms and that on April 13, 1787, they surveyed Montours Island and returned the survey into the Surveyor-General's Office, setting forth that it was made for Charles Simms, assignee of William Douglass, under the Virginia warrant entry and location.

The Supreme Court held that a military right to lands obtained under a royal proclamation in 1763 was assignable under the laws of Virginia to an inhabitant of that State, and that obtaining a warrant on that right and locating it gave the assignee an equitable title which was confirmed by the compact between Pennsylvania and Virginia, and so upheld the Simms title.

General Irvine, a loyal and faithful citizen of Pennsylvania, was thus compelled to surrender his title to Montours Island, which had been granted to by him by the Legislature. To indemnify him, the Legislature subsequently gave him a State reservation of 2000 acres at the mouth of Harbor Creek on Lake Erie.

This condensed statement of this celebrated controversy is found in a very interesting paper on this Virginia boundary question in the Report of the Pennsylvania Secretary of Internal Affairs of 1895.

It is interesting to note that this most important

and leading case on the boundary controversy was decided in favor of the Virginia entry.

In stating the principles upon which the disputes between the Virginia and Pennsylvania settlers claiming under different entries were settled, I cannot do better than to quote from this excellent paper:

“There were instances within the disputed territory where the same lands were granted to different persons by the authorities of each State, but provision was made for such conflicting claims in the Acts ratifying the boundary agreement. For the adjustment of such cases, it was enacted that in the decision of disputes ‘preference was to be given to the elder or prior right in whichever of the States the same had been acquired, the persons paying, within whose boundary the land was included, the same purchase money which would have been due from them to the State under which they claimed the right’, etc., so that a Virginia title, obtained in conformity with the laws of the State, if older than a Pennsylvania title, was to be preferred, and vice versa. To the honor of the Courts of Pennsylvania, it may be said that in all cases tried before them which involved a conflict between Pennsylvania and Virginia titles, the compact between the States was held to be inviolate, and by every consideration of moral and political obligation, to be upheld and enforced with fidelity; and today, within the territory, so long a matter of earnest contention, land titles are so well settled that there is probably no section of the State, unless the three original and a few of the older Counties, in which there is less land litigation than in the Counties formed out of the disputed district.”

The story of the Pennsylvania and Virginia boundary controversy stands out in strong contrast with the story of the Pennamite War, that long, bitter and cruel struggle between the settlers under the Connecticut Grants in the Wyoming Valley and the speculators who

had purchased the same lands from the Penns in Philadelphia.

The treatment which the Connecticut settlers received from our Pennsylvania settlers, Legislatures and Courts, constitutes a black chapter of injustice and oppression extending over a century.

The awful tale of the Indian Massacre of the Wyoming Valley seems too horrible for belief, yet the plundered and homeless survivors of that Massacre, instead of receiving the pity and encouragement they so sorely needed, within a very few years were again driven from their homes by the Militia sent out on behalf of the Philadelphia land speculators.

Perhaps the most disgraceful feature of this controversy was the policy of the Pennsylvania Legislature which, under fear of the Wyoming Valley being formed into a separate State, passed an Act in 1787 confirming the titles of the Connecticut settlers, only to repeal the Act in 1790 as soon as the danger of interference from New York and New England was apparently passed. If you think this picture too strongly drawn, just read the chapter on the Pennamite War in the "Making of Pennsylvania," written by a Philadelphian, Sydney George Fisher.

Sometimes we of Western Pennsylvania may have the finger of scorn pointed at us on account of the local Rebellion known as the "Whiskey Insurrection" (although I am afraid the truth is that we are all rather proud of it than otherwise), or on account of that story of which we really should hang our heads in shame, the Massacre of the Moravian Indians at Gnadenhutten (although the last was a blind, hot-headed act of revenge for a series of repeated Indian murders and massacres). Yet when one reads the story of the Pennamite War and the injustice perpetrated by those of Eastern Pennsylvania, he cannot help thinking that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

But now, to return to the question, the explanation of the comparatively peaceful settlement of the Pennsylvania-Virginia boundary controversy locally between the settlers claiming under the different grants. The writer has long endeavored to discover in the histories, biographies and chronicles bearing upon the settlement of this region, any effort to trace a distinctive type of the Virginia settler as separate from the Pennsylvania Colonist, but there is apparently very little to be found on this subject. The nearest approach is the following extract from a work of a revered local historian, who was for so many years President of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania.

In Warner's History of Allegheny County Dr. Lambing says:

"In general, it may be said that the settlers were, for the most part, from Virginia, while the Indian traders were Pennsylvanians; and that while it was to the interest of the former to drive the natives back, exterminate or get rid of them by any means, and the more summary the better, the latter wished, on the contrary, to cultivate friendly relations with them. This gave rise to a conflict of interests; and although the Virginians seemed to have the better of it in the possession of the lands, the Pennsylvanians held the centre of trade and population with its celebrated Fort, which commanded the water courses, a matter of the greatest importance in those days."

Dr. Lambing also calls attention to the Act passed March 1, 1780, for gradual abolition of slavery, providing that all negroes and mulattoes born after the passage of the Act who would, but for the passage of said Act, been servants for years, or life, or a slave, shall remain the servant of such person entitled to their services until they attain the age of twenty-eight years, and goes on to state that this Act was very offensive to the settlers from Virginia who had brought

slaves with them. It is even said that General Washington was so displeased that he regarded it as a personal affront and disposed of all his real and personal property in Fayette County.

It is also said that a large portion of the Virginians and Marylanders who had settled with their slaves west of Laurel Hill became so angry at the passage of the measure and the location of the boundary line which placed them in Pennsylvania instead of Virginia, that they sold out their holdings and moved with their slaves to Kentucky, to which section there was a very heavy immigration soon after 1780.

Some claim that in certain portions of Fayette County there is even now a noticeable difference between the people living on the north and south sides of the Youghiogheny which can be traced back to the Pennsylvania and Virginia ancestors. Also that some of the Church quarrels of long standing in that section can be traced back to the feeling between the forefathers of a century and more back. Yet those making these statements claim that these dissensions were not caused by difference of race, but a difference of opinion between those of the same blood.

Mr. Boyd Crumrine, already referred to, has informed the writer that after long and careful investigation, study and inquiry, he is of the opinion that there is no distinctive type of the early Virginia settlers in Western Pennsylvania, for the reason that the great majority of these settlers are of the same Scotch-Irish stock which later came over the mountains from Eastern Pennsylvania. In fact, very many of these early Virginia settlers had originally settled in Pennsylvania and had moved from Lancaster and Bucks Counties, Pennsylvania, to Virginia and from that State to this section.

The writer believes that this view is correct and that, to a very great extent, the conflicting parties in this struggle were of the same race and blood.

While this may appear to furnish an answer to the question as to why the long and bitter controversy was, in the main, so easily, quickly and peaceably settled after the adjustment was finally agreed to between the two commonwealths, yet any student of history well knows that the struggles between those of the same blood have often proved of the longest standing and the most irreconcilable.

The conclusion certainly cannot be avoided that the greater portion of the credit for the so desirable and praiseworthy condition following the actual settlement of the Pennsylvania-Virginia controversy, is due, in great part, to the sturdy common sense, good judgment, Christian patriotism and peace-loving disposition of the settlers in the territory affected by the question involved.

The critical spirit of the age seems so determined to emphasize the weaknesses, failings and shortcomings of the early settlers in Southwestern Pennsylvania, that it is high time that at least occasionally the forefathers are viewed from the other standpoint, and honor given where honor is due.